

Minutes of Cedar Valley Public Meeting
July 21, 2004 – Eagle Mountain City Council Chamber
Eagle Mountain, Utah

State Engineer called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM.

State Engineer welcomed the attendees, stated the purpose of the meeting, and outlined the agenda to be followed. The purpose of the meeting was to present to water users the hydrogeologic data that has been recently developed and the State Engineer's interpretation and conclusions from that data. He stated that urbanization of Cedar Valley and adjacent areas of Utah Valley was placing an increased demand on the water resources available for development. In order to maintain the quantity and quality of the water, the State Engineer has undertaken studies to define the extent of the resource.

Jim Riley, Utah Lake/Jordan River Regional Engineer, reviewed the past studies and the conclusions they reached. He showed slides delineating the Cedar Valley drainage basin, reviewed the conclusions of previous studies. He stated that Feltis, in 1967, reached the following conclusions: 1) Most recharge comes from Oquirrh Mountains on the northwest corner of the valley and moves across the valley in an east-southeasterly direction toward Cedar Pass, Lake Mountain, and the Mosida Hills; 2) the quality decreases along the flow path; 3) recharge is estimated to be about 25,000 acre-feet per year (afa), with discharge on the east side of the valley estimated to be between 10,000 and 20,000 afa; and 4) ground-water leaves the valley through fractures, solution channels, and bedding plane flow in Lake Mountain, through bedrock in the Cedar Pass area, and through the Mosida Hills area. The current ground-water management plan is based on these conclusions. That plan has the following components: 1) the valley is closed to new appropriations; 2) any small domestic applications still pending would be acted upon; 3) new withdrawals must be based on transfer of existing rights; 4) those applications would be limited to a total withdrawal of 15,000 afa; 5) applications will be considered on their own merits; 6) consideration would be given to applications proposing delivery by a central system and discharge through a sanitary sewage system; 7) proof of appropriation must state the withdrawal in afa; and 8) proofs must include a map showing lands being withdrawn from production. Currently, there are 50 surface water rights with the potential of withdrawing about 2,650 afa and 390 underground water rights with a potential withdrawal of about 12,900 afa. He illustrated the importance of defining location of the topographic divide between Cedar and Utah Valleys and its effect on managing water rights in that area. In conclusion he posed three questions needing to be answered. First, what is the location of the surface drainage boundary in the Cedar Pass area? Second, how does that boundary compare to ground-water movement in the area? Third, how do water rights in the Cedar Pass area affect the rest of Cedar Valley?

Hugh Hurlow, Project Geologist with the Utah Geological Survey, presented the results of his geologic framework study. He began by detailing the general topography of the valley and showed a map illustrating the ground-water contours. Next, he presented data showing that ground-water quality, as defined by total dissolved solids concentrations,

deteriorates as water moves across the valley in both basin-fill and bedrock aquifers. He showed a trilinear diagram indicating that sodium chloride water dominates in the southern valley, while calcium/magnesium carbonate water is found in the north. A map of transmissivities showed that parameter of water-passing capacity varied between 100 and 28,500 ft²/d. A map of the valley's surface geology was shown followed by an isopach map estimating the depth of the basin-fill material. Maps and cross-section diagrams were displayed showing the likely subsurface structure of the valley in three different areas.

State Engineer summarized the data presented and took questions from the attendees.

A questioner asked about the status of Cedar Fort Irrigation Company's surface water right, which he claimed was being reduced. The State Engineer said that most of that reduction was due to drought conditions.

A questioner asked about the status of unapproved change applications. The State Engineer said they would be considered on their own merits.

A questioner asked if the Eagle Mountain wells were finished in alluvium or bedrock. A representative of Eagle Mountain City said they were finished in bedrock.

There was a discussion of how actual well pumpage compares to withdrawals allowed under the respective water rights, how there is a need for better management on non-public water suppliers' wells and the 15,000 afa limit mentioned in Jim Riley's presentation.

A questioner asked how the volume of current ground-water withdrawals compares to the total volume of approved and perfected withdrawals. The State Engineer replied that the volume of current withdrawal is roughly one-third of the volume allowed (15,000 afa), and that more accurate discharge measurements are needed on some wells. The State Engineer invited water users to share data and join the Division of Water Rights in collecting accurate pumping and water-level information.

A questioner asked if it was possible to bring Central Utah Project (CUP) water into the valley. The State Engineer said that the Central Utah Water Conservancy District has said that Cedar Valley water users were not interested in CUP water. Further discussion revealed that there might be some misunderstanding; "funded water" was fully committed, but "unfunded water" was still available.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 PM.